AP CollegeBoard

AP® Seminar Performance Task 1: Team Project and Presentation
Scoring Guidelines

Individual Research Report (IRR)   30 points

General Scoring Notes

- When applying the rubric for each individual row, you should award the score for that row based solely upon the criteria indicated for that row, according to the preponderance of evidence.
- You should start by reading the title and then moving to evaluate the bibliography/works cited, but read the whole report before assigning a score for any row.
- Reward the student for skills they have demonstrated. Demonstrating means that there is evidence that you can point to in the report.

0 (Zero) Scores

- A score of 0 is assigned to a single row of the rubric when the response displays a below-minimum level of quality as identified in that row of the rubric. For rows 1 to 4, if there is no evidence of any research (i.e., it is all opinion and there is nothing in the bibliography, no citation or attributed phrases in the response) then a score of 0 should be assigned.
- Scores of 0 are assigned to all rows of the rubric when the response is off-topic; a repetition of a prompt; entirely crossed-out; a drawing or other markings; or a response in a language other than English.

NR (No Response)
A score of NR is assigned to responses that are blank.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 1 **Understand and Analyze Context** **(0, 2, 4 or 6 points)**	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for two points.	**2 points** The report identifies an overly broad or simplistic area of investigation and/or shows little evidence of research. A simplistic connection or no connection is made to the overall problem or issue.	**4 points** The report identifies an adequately focused area of investigation in the research and shows some variety in source selection. It makes some reference to the overall problem or issue.	**6 points** The report situates the student's investigation of the complexities of a problem or issue in research that draws upon a wide variety of appropriate sources. It makes clear the significance to a larger context.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Provide no evidence of research (i.e., there is a complete absence of bibliography, internal citations, and attributive tags that point to a research source. If one of these is present, cannot score 0).	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Address a very general topic of investigation (e.g. "pollution"). • Draw mainly from one or two sources or poor-quality sources. • Provide unsubstantiated assertions about the significance of the investigation (e.g. "*this is important*").	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Identify too many aspects of the topic to address complexity (e.g. "air, water, and land pollution"). • May be overly reliant on journalistic sources or lack any academic/scholarly sources. • May provide generalized statements about the significance of the investigation.	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** • Clearly state an area of investigation that is narrow enough to address the complexity of the problem or issue (e.g. "water pollution in India"). The context established is sustained throughout. • Include research that draws on some academic/scholarly sources. • Provide specific and relevant details to convey why the problem or issue matters/is important.
	Additional Notes • The research context is located often in the titles of the reports and first paragraphs, but the whole report needs to sustain the focus throughout. • Review Bibliography or Works Cited (but also check that context is established by sources actually used, especially academic sources).			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 2 Understand and Analyze Argument (0, 2, 4 or 6 points)	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for two points.	**2 points** The report restates or misstates information from sources. It doesn't address reasoning in the sources or it does so in a very simplistic way.	**4 points** The report summarizes information and in places offers effective explanation of the reasoning within the sources' argument (but does so inconsistently).	**6 points** The report demonstrates an understanding of the reasoning and validity of the sources' arguments.* This can be evidenced by direct explanation or through purposeful use of the reasoning and conclusions.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Provide no evidence of research.	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Make no distinction between paraphrased material and response's commentary; demonstrate no instances of effective explanation. • Do not anchor ideas to sources.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Are dominated by summary of source material rather than explanation of sources' arguments; provide some instances of effective explanation of authors' reasoning. • Occasionally lack clarity about what is commentary and what is from the source material.	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** • Provide commentary that explains authors' reasoning, claims or conclusions **(direct explanation)**. • Make effective use of authors' reasoning, claims or conclusions (showing understanding of the sources) **(purposeful use).** • Attribute clearly source material (i.e., readers always able to tell what comes from what source).
	Additional Notes • * Validity is defined as "the extent to which an argument or claim is logical." • Reference to arguments from the sources used often appears at the end of paragraphs and / or immediately following an in-text citation as part of the commentary on a source. • Clear attribution, (i.e. readers are always able to tell what comes from what source and what kind of source it is) must be present in order for the report to demonstrate "purposeful use."			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 3 **Evaluate Sources and Evidence** **(0, 2, 4 or 6 points)**	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for two points.	**2 points** The report identifies evidence from chosen sources. It makes very simplistic, illogical, or no reference to the credibility of sources and evidence, and their relevance to the inquiry.	**4 points** The report in places offers some effective explanation of the chosen sources and evidence in terms of their credibility and relevance to the inquiry (but does so inconsistently).	**6 points** The report demonstrates evaluation of credibility of the sources and selection of relevant evidence from the sources. Both can be evidenced by direct explanation or through purposeful use.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Provide no evidence.	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Provide evidence that is either poorly selected or poorly explained (in terms of relevance and credibility). • Provide evidence that is irrelevant or only obliquely relevant.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Include descriptions but the attributions are insufficient to establish credibility. • Pay attention to the evidence, but not the source (may treat all evidence as equal when it is not). • Draw upon research that may be clearly outdated without a rationale for using that older evidence.	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** • Provide descriptions in the attributions that effectively establish credibility of the source and relevance of evidence **(direct explanation)**. • Make effective use of well-chosen, relevant evidence from credible academic sources **(purposeful use).**
	Additional Notes • In Row 1, the judgement is whether the bibliography allows for complex context; Row 3 judges whether the incremental examples of evidence presented are well-selected and well-used. • Purposeful use, in this case, refers to the deployment of relevant evidence from a credible source. Clear attribution, (i.e. readers are always able to tell what comes from what source and what kind of source it is) must be present in order for the report to demonstrate "purposeful use."			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 4 **Understand and Analyze Perspective** (0, 2, 4, or 6 points)	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for two points.	**2 points** The report identifies few and/or oversimplified perspectives from sources.**	**4 points** The report identifies multiple perspectives from sources, making some general connections among those perspectives.**	**6 points** The report discusses a range of perspectives and draws explicit and relevant connections among those perspectives.**
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Provide no evidence of research (only opinion).	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Might include a minimal range of perspectives but they are not connected (they are isolated from each other). • Juxtapose perspectives but connections are not clear (they must be inferred).	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Include multiple perspectives and include some instances of general connections. • Include multiple perspectives that are connected, but do not explain the relationships among them by clarifying or elaborating on the points on which they are connected.	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** • Go beyond mere identification of multiple perspectives by using details from different sources' arguments to explain specific relationships or connections among perspectives (i.e., placing them in dialogue).
	Additional Notes • **A perspective is a "point of view conveyed through an argument." (This means the source's argument). • Throughout the report pay attention to organization of paragraphs (and possibly headings) as it's a common way to group perspectives. • Readers should pay attention to transitions as effective transitions may signal connections among perspectives.			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 5 **Apply Conventions** **(0–3 points)**	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for one point.	**1 point** The report includes many errors in attribution and citation OR the bibliography is inconsistent in style and format and/or incomplete.	**2 points** The report attributes or cites sources used but not always accurately. The bibliography references sources using a consistent style.	**3 points** The report attributes and accurately cites the sources used. The bibliography accurately references sources using a consistent style.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Provide no evidence of research.	Typical responses that earn 1 point (many errors): • Include internal citations, but no bibliography (or vice versa). • Demonstrate no organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical). • Provide little or no evidence of successful linking of in-text citations to bibliographic references (e.g., in-text references are to titles but bibliographic references are listed by author; titles are different in the text and in the works cited). • Include poor or no attributive phrasing with paraphrased material (e.g., "Studies show…"; "Research says…" with no additional in-text citation).	Typical responses that earn 2 points (some errors): • Provide some uniformity in citation style. • Provide, perhaps with a few lapses, an organizational principle in bibliography/works cited (e.g., alphabetical or numerical). • Include unclear references or errors in citations, (e.g., citations with missing elements or essential elements that must be guessed from a url). • Provide some successful linking of citations to bibliographic references. • Provide some successful attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations.	Typical responses that earn 3 points (few significant flaws): • Contain few flaws. • Provide clear organization principle in bibliography/works cited. • Provide consistent evidence of linking internal citations to bibliographic references. • Include consistent and clear attributive phrasing for paraphrased material and/or in-text parenthetical citations. **Scoring note:** The response cannot score 3 points if key components of citations (i.e., author/organization, title, publication, date) are consistently missing.
	Additional Notes • In AP Seminar, there is no requirement for using a particular style sheet; however, responses must use a style that is consistent and complete. • Check the bibliography for consistency in style (and if there are fundamental elements missing). • Check for clarity/accuracy in internal citations. • Check to make sure all internal citations match up to the bibliography. In order for links to work in print, there must be a clear organizational principle arranging the elements on the bib/works cited.			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 6 **Apply Conventions** **(0-3 points)**	**0 points** Does not meet the criteria for one point.	**1 point** The report contains many flaws in grammar that often interfere with communication to the reader. The written style is not appropriate for an academic audience.	**2 points** The report is generally clear but contains some flaws in grammar that occasionally interfere with communication to the reader. The written style is inconsistent and not always appropriate for an academic audience.	**3 points** The report communicates clearly to the reader (although may not be free of errors in grammar and style). The written style is consistently appropriate for an academic audience.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points:	**Typical responses that earn 1 point:** • May contain many instances where sentences are not controlled. • May rely almost exclusively on simplistic language (e.g., This is good. This is bad). • Employ an overall style that is not appropriate for an academic report; or colloquial tone. • Include many passages that are incoherent. • Provide too few sentences to evaluate or the student's own words are indistinguishable from paraphrases of sources.	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Contain some lapses in sentence control (e.g., run-ons, fragments, or mixed construction when integrating quoted material). • Demonstrate imprecise or vague word choice insufficient to communicate complexity of ideas. • Sometimes lapse into colloquial language. • Use overly dense prose that lacks clarity and precision.	**Typical responses that earn 3 points:** • Contain few flaws which do not impede clarity for understanding of complex ideas. • Demonstrate word choice sufficient to communicate complex ideas. • Use clear prose.
	Additional Notes • Because this is a **report**, the prose is judged by its ability to clearly and precisely articulate complex research content. • Readers should focus on the sentences written by the student, not those quoted or derived from sources.			

Team Multimedia Presentation (TMP) 24 points

General Scoring Notes

- Do not repeatedly rewind or re-listen to recorded presentations.
- There is a time limit. **Only the first 10 minutes** of any presentation are scored (excluding the oral defense).
- The defense is scored only after the presentation proper is scored. The defense does not impact the scores in Rows 1-4.

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 1 Establish Argument (0, 2, 4 or 6 points)	**0 points** The presentation offers a series of unsubstantiated opinions. It is not academic in nature.	**2 points** The presentation describes the existence of a problem or reports on a problem, but does not argue for a team solution or resolution.	**4 points** The presentation conveys the argument for the team's solution or resolution using evidence that is not well selected for the situation.	**6 points** The presentation conveys the convincing argument for the team's solution or resolution through strategic selection of supporting evidence.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points:	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Provide only individual solutions rather than a team solution (offer a series of unconnected individual arguments). • Present individual reports yoked by a very broad theme or offer evidence related to a topic (rather than an argument). • Identify a team solution that is not explained, justified, or supported. • Argue for the existence of a problem with a solution tagged on at the very end. • Demonstrate almost no principles of selection and emphasis. • Have a solution that needs a lot of work to infer. • Offer a solution that has little or no connection to the problem.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Present a clear and coherent argument for a team solution but only some claims are supported by evidence. • Demonstrate selection and emphasis that are not always controlling: at times may have instances of extraneous information or too much for time limit; at times may lack focus demonstrated in digressions or repetition. • Offer a solution that has some logical connection to the problem, but it is weak (for example, overgeneralized, oversimplified) • Demonstrate only some logical connection among speakers.	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** • Present a clear, coherent, and complex argument for the team solution. • Make the logic of the argument clear through strategic selection of key claims and relevant supporting evidence. • Contain only relevant material sufficient to successfully make the argument within the given time limit (any repetition is effective). • Present a viable and convincing solution that is tightly connected to the argument and illustrates the complexity of the issue. • Demonstrate mostly consistent, logical connection among speakers.
	Additional Notes •			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row 2 **Understand and Analyze Context (Evaluate Solutions)** **(0, 2, or 4 points)**	**0 points** The presentation does not identify or only minimally identifies solutions, either the team's or others' (e.g., a list of solutions with brief annotations).	**2 points** The presentation describes pros and/or cons of potential options related to the topic. OR The presentation describes limitations or implications of the solution proposed by the team, but in an inconsistent, illogical, overly broad, or otherwise unconvincing manner.	**4 points** The presentation explains the pros and/or cons of potential options and situates the team's proposed solution in conversation with them. AND The presentation evaluates the solution proposed by the team by thoroughly explaining its limitations or implications.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Meet neither of the rubric criteria for 2 points.	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Meet one of the rubric criteria or partially meet both criteria.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Fully meet both rubric criteria.
	Additional Notes		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria			
Row 3 **Engage Audience (Performance)** **(0, 2, 4 or 6 points)**	**0 points** The presenting is entirely inappropriate for the audience, purpose or context.	**2 points** All or all but one of the presenters make little or no use of techniques to engage the audience.	**4 points** At times, some presenters (i.e. more than one) effectively engage the audience. As a team the presenters demonstrate uneven delivery or performance techniques.	**6 points** All presenters effectively engage the audience through strategic intentional use of performance techniques most of the time.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes			
	Typical responses that earn 0 points:	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Have only one presenter that uses strategies to effectively engage the audience. • Have no presenters that use strategies to effectively engage the audience.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Have at least two presenters use strategies to effectively engage the audience at least some of the time (but others don't).	**Typical responses that earn 6 points:** • Have all presenters use strategies to effectively engage the audience (most of the time). **Scoring note:** There may be minor lapses at this level, but they do not detract from the overall impression of an engaging presentation.
	Additional Notes **Performance techniques that do not engage the audience include:** • Lack of eye contact with audience (e.g. staring at slides, at note cards, into space, or at the floor). • Lack of vocal variety, monotone, or mumbling. • Rate of speech is too fast to be comprehensible or too slow to maintain interest. • Being distracted by presenter support materials (e.g. note cards, slides, or teleprompters). Reciting from memory or teleprompter in a way that compromises connection with the audience (as if not talking to actual people). • Lack of energy (seem bored by the project). • Movement that is distracting (e.g. fidgeting, swaying, slumping, excessive hand movements for no strategic purpose) or complete lack of movement. **Effective performance techniques to engage the audience include:** • Eye contact with audience. • Vocal variety is used to emphasize important information (e.g., volume, pause, rhetorical question). • Effective rate of speech (controlled, well-paced, not rushed or overly dense with information). • Use of presenter support materials (e.g. note cards, slides, or teleprompters) does not compromise connection to the audience. • Effectively incorporates into the presentation supporting materials (e.g. visuals, slides, handouts, posters). • Energy (seem interested in the project). • Movement (gestures serve to emphasize key points).			

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row 4 **Engage Audience (Design)** **(0, 2, or 4 points)**	**0 points** The presentation demonstrates no design or minimal design with significant errors.	**2 points** The presentation's design demonstrates an understanding of media and design elements but does not enhance the team's message, or does so inconsistently.	**4 points** Overall, the design clearly guides viewers through the presentation and demonstrates strategic selection of media and design elements that help clarify the argument for the team's solution.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Provide visuals that may be little more than blocks of pasted information or informal notes. • Provide little or no signposting to guide audience. • Demonstrate no clear principle of visual design across speakers.	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Provide visuals that guide the audience through the argument but are at times illogical, confusing, or otherwise ineffective (in terms of signposting, emphasis). • Include several visuals that display information overload or a poor selection of supporting words and images (decorative but not argumentatively purposeful, or unreadable in the time frame they are shown). • May include visuals that contain some noticeable, significant errors. • Demonstrate inconsistent visual and design cohesion across the team (e.g., hierarchy of information, cohesion of imagery, metaphor, parallel structure).	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Provide visuals that overall serve a clear purpose in organizing or advancing the team argument (such as signposting, emphasis). • Include well-chosen words and images throughout to highlight key points or information. • Present visuals that contain little clutter or visual "noise"; they enhance rather than compete with the speaker's message, there are no extraneous images or "data dumps". • Create cohesion through consistency of design across the team throughout.
	Additional Notes		

Reporting Category	Scoring Criteria		
Row 5 **Collaborate Reflect** **(0, 2, or 4 points)**	**0 points** All or all but one member of the team offer generic responses that could apply to any collaborative project. Or the answers by all or all but one of the team may be unacceptably brief.	**2 points** Two or more of the responses in the oral defense support their answers with some relevant evidence specific to the team's project.	**4 points** All responses in the oral defense articulate detailed answers to the question asked and support those answers with relevant evidence specific to collaboration on this project. AND The answers in the oral defense taken together with the presentation demonstrate roughly equal participation from all team members.
	Decision Rules and Scoring Notes		
	Typical responses that earn 0 points: • Have only one presenter that provides specific and relevant evidence about the team's project. • Have no presenters that provide specific and relevant evidence about the team's project	**Typical responses that earn 2 points:** • Have at least two presenters provide specific and relevant evidence about the team's project.	**Typical responses that earn 4 points:** • Have all presenters provide specific and relevant evidence about the team's collaborative work, and answer the question posed.
	Additional Notes		